

EPA PROJECT OFFICER POST-AWARD EVALUATION PROTOCOL
(USED FOR ADVANCED AND BASELINE MONITORING)
CHESAPEAKE BAY PROGRAM OFFICE (CBPO)

To prevent potential problems with the Paperwork Reduction Act, Project Officers should not give this protocol to the recipient or direct the issues as questions to the recipient.

BACKGROUND INFORMATION (PART 1)

MID YEAR/SIX MONTH: <u>_X_</u> CLOSEOUT: _____	GRANT NUMBER(s): CB96331901	
1. DATE PREPARED: 8/25/15	2. RECIPIENT NAME: PA Dept of Environmental Protection	
3. ENTER ALL DATES: a. OFF-SITE CONFERENCE CALL DATE: 8/25/15 b. ON-SITE REVIEW DATE: (enter date if applicable, otherwise N/A) c. REPORT DATE: 8/27/15 (Date Report Sent by Email to Grantee) d. CLOSED DATE: 9/02/15 (Date all major issues resolved, if applicable, otherwise this date is same as Report Date.)	4. PROJECT OFFICER(s): PARTICIPANTS/PERSONS CONTACTED: (Names /Affiliations) -EPA: Lucinda Power, PA CBIG (CBPO) Project Officer Holly Waldman, CBPO grants coordinator - GRANTEE: Steve Taglang, Project Manager PADEP CBIG Fred Fiscus, PA DEP staff	
5. <u>AWARD INFORMATION</u> Grant <u>_ X _</u> Cooperative Agreement _____	6. <u>PROJECT / BUDGET PERIOD DATES:</u>	
	BEGINNING	ENDING
	Project Period: 7/01/2014	6/30/19
	Budget Period: 7/01/2014	6/30/19
7. <u>AWARD AMOUNT</u> EPA share: \$18,606,220 Recipient share/Match: \$18,606,220 EPA IN-KIND: NA Total: \$37,212,440	8. <u>BRIEF PROJECT DESCRIPTION:</u> This grant agreement aids the recipient in the implementation of BMPs that reduce nutrient and sediment pollution in PA's portion of the Chesapeake Bay watershed. This work will achieve and maintain the water quality necessary to improve the aquatic living resources of the Bay and its tributaries.	

BACKGROUND INFORMATION (PART 1) CONTINUED

9. PROVIDE BRIEF DESCRIPTION OF RECIPIENT:

Provide Background Information of Recipient, i.e. State Agency, University, Local Government, and Not For Profit. Background Information may be included in Statement of Work. (Example: This is a “Not For Profit” membership organization representing a broad coalition of interests united in support of the conservation, protection and restoration of the Potomac River watershed.....). If background information is not included in the Statement of Work, request recipient to e-mail their description to you.

Response: The state of Pennsylvania is a signatory to the 1983, 1987, 2000 and 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreements. DEP is the lead state agency for implementing Bay restoration and water quality improvement activities in the Potomac and Susquehanna river basins.

10. DISCUSS PREVIOUS RECOMMENDATIONS/CONCERNS/OPEN PROGRAMMATIC FINDINGS, IF ANY EXIST; ARE THEY OR WILL THEY BE REMEDIED?:

a. Open Programmatic Findings in Last Monitoring Review (Refer to Part II, Item 7, PO Suggestions and Recommendations). If applicable, are there any open programmatic findings for this Award in last monitoring review (could not provide a “closed date” on last monitoring review report because of major finding(s))? Provide date of resolution and explanation on how finding(s) have been resolved.

Response: NA

RESULTS OF REVIEW WITH RECOMMENDATIONS (success & findings) - PART II

1. Scope of Review: Summarize the purpose of your review.

If appropriate, list issues that will be raised for resolution during the review (e.g., need response on why the recipient spent half of the grant award and hasn't produced a literature review).

Response: Conduct a six-month review to assess progress toward achieving commitments as outlined in the workplan and ensure that all deliverables have been submitted and approved as required to date.

2. Financial: POs are responsible for:

>Analyzing the budget information in the reports by reviewing the payment history (using recipient progress reports, Financial Status Reports, or Compass Data Warehouse reports) and comparing actual amounts spent against the planned budget in the work plan.

>Providing rebudget approval to the Grants Specialist on the recipients request to rebudget grant funds or on other actions which require prior approval from EPA.

PO to Review, Discuss, and Respond:

a. Has the recipient begun work under this assistance agreement? If no, provide explanation.

Response: Yes

b. How is this award funded? (Fully, Incrementally, Supplementary)

Response: Incrementally

If response is *incrementally funded* then complete the following questions:

- **Have all increments been funded?**

Response: No

Enter an explanation: Amount the Recipient has received in incremental funding:

Response: This is a multi-year (5 year) award and will be ending June 30, 2019. (BP/PP = 7/01/14 – 6/30/19). The recipient has received \$3,781,244 to date, with contingent funding of \$14,824,976.

If response is for *supplementary funded* awards, complete the following information:

- **Amount the Recipient has received in supplemental funding:**

Response: NA

- **The current total funding for this award, which includes the supplemental funding:**

Response: NA

c. Ensure funds are available to complete the project:

Answer the following:

*Amount of EPA funds awarded: \$3,781,244

*Amount of EPA funds paid: \$366,482

*Remaining Balance: \$3,414,762

% of Project Completed: 9.6%

% of Funds Paid: 9.6%

* Information found on Compass Data Warehouse Report at

<https://ocfosystem1.epa.gov/neis/adw.welcome>

d. Is the recipient making draw-downs on this award in accordance with the workplan since the award date or last monitoring review?

Response: Yes – the recipient has made 45 draw-downs since the last monitoring review (which was 1/28/15)

e. Is the payment history consistent with the progress to date?

Response: Yes

f. Do the drawdowns seem reasonable and capture the progress to date based on the project duration and workplan?

Response: Yes – the expended and remaining funds are reasonable. According to our Compass system, \$366,482 has been spent since the July 2014 start of the award.

g. Is the remaining funding on this award necessary to complete the project?

Response: Yes

h. Verify with recipient if there is enough funding in place to cover expected costs? If no, provide explanation. (*Contact either Lori Mackey or Holly Waldman for assistance to possibly add funds*)

Response: Yes, however they are still waiting to receive their FY15 funding.

i. Are the Project/Budget Period(s) long enough to cover the time that it will take to complete the project? If no, provide explanation. (*Contact either Lori Mackey or Holly Waldman for assistance prior to requesting time extension request from recipient.*)

Response: Yes

j. Does the recipient's most current EPA approved work plan require any PO/Grant Office approvals/amendments for cost or activities not included in the original award? Respond to the following:

- **Movement/transfer of funds in grantee's total approved budget more than 10% between cost categories.**

Response: No

- **Re-budgeting between direct and indirect costs (Part 30 or 31 recipients only).**

Response: No

- **Changes to equipment costs not included in the most current approved work plan.**

Response: NA

- **Changes in key personnel.** (Ex: Has turnover in staff caused delays in completing the funded activities?) Yes or No response required. Also, note if the changes were either 1) approved and recipient notified; or 2) conditionally approved and recipient notified; or 3) denied and recipient notified.

Response: Pat Buckley (PA primary staff person for EPA/CBP) left the recipient agency January 24, 2014. Her replacement, Kristin Wolf has since joined the team. Dave Lewis (the admin staff person that managed all the subawards for this grant) retired 6/26/15. His replacement is still pending.

- **Food or refreshments at events not identified in most current approved work plan.**

Response: No

- **Unplanned travel expenses not identified in most current approved work plan.**

Response: No

- **Changes in the project's approved scope of work.**

Response: No, not at this time but slight changes will likely be made in their workplan prior to their FY15 award.

3. Technical: POs are responsible for:

- > *comparing the recipient's work plan/application to actual progress under the award.*
- > *monitoring all activities and the recipient's progress on the project.*
- > *providing comments to the recipient on the progress reports and other work products.*
- > *apprizing program staff who are responsible for parts of the project/program on issues which*

need resolution.

> recommending actions that require the attention of Grants Office or others.

a. List work plan/application tasks, compare to actual work progress, and identify areas of concern cited in the progress report. Provide a summary of each task and current status:

Response:

Obj 1: Program Management, Evaluation and Planning

Maintained twelve continuous water quality monitors for dissolved oxygen, pH, specific conductance, temperature and turbidity (not all). This includes bi-weekly recalibration using side-by-side technique, probe replacement and cleaning following intensive QAQC protocols for continuous data collection.

- Collected algae from natural substrate at ≈ 30 sites including both tributary and mainstem river sites. Algae will be analyzed for biomass (chlorophyll-a and biovolume) and community structure.
- Collected over 80 chemical grab samples (nutrients and TSS) over all algae/continuous monitoring sites.
- Assisted in fish at ≈ 25 sites to document fish community structure as well as fish health assessment.
- Worked on MS4/TMDL issues related to Chesapeake Bay requirements and municipality reporting. Supported GIS tracking of downstream impacts from MS4s for use in determining permit reporting requirements.
- Conducted macroinvertebrate surveys at ≈ 25 sites Susquehanna tributaries
- Collected data in support of development/validation of nutrient impairment determination protocol.
- Implemented the nutrient related monitoring effort in the Susquehanna small mouth bass study.
- Submitted the semi-annual report of accomplishments to EPA on February 2, 2015.

Obj 2: TMDL and TMDL Alternative Plan

SRBC worked with partners from DEP, Penn State and the Lancaster County Conservation District to move to public stage of the Chiques Creek TMDL Alternative project. Organized and facilitated the first meeting with outside stakeholders in January 2015.

- Continued organizational duties for the Chiques Creek TMDL Alternative project with monthly calls of steering committee
- Collected macroinvertebrates at 23 sites in the Chiques Creek watershed in April 2015
- Assisted in the initial stages of model development for Chiques Creek
- Assisted in deployment of continuous water quality monitors for DO, pH, temperature, specific conductance and turbidity in Chiques Creek
- Continued re-modeling of entire 175 square mile Octoraro Creek watershed and re-write of sediment TMDL.
- Collected Water chemistry and Macroinvertebrates at 43 sites in Conestoga watershed, as part of long-term ongoing monitoring for future TMDL development
- Continued operation and maintenance of two real-time water quality monitoring stations within Cedar Run for all of FY15. Corrected Raw field data from real-time stations.
 - ✓ Collected 2 rounds of Baseflow conditions water chemistry samples as well as two storm events.
 - ✓ Collected Fish and Macroinvertebrates at 5 and 9 stations respectively.

- ✓ Completed analysis on data from prior three years monitoring effort within Cedar Run Watershed.

Obj 3: Chesapeake Bay Education Office

Chesapeake Bay Program Conservation District and PA Agency Staff Meeting completed - The meeting was held March 10, 2015 at Bucknell University. There were 153 attendees from conservation districts, DEP, and partners. Topics included the Overview of the New Chesapeake Bay Agreement, Chesapeake Bay Model, New Initiatives for Farmers in Berks County, Financial Assistance Programs and updates from DEP. The meeting materials were posted on the PACD website at <http://pacd.org/education/chesapeake-bay-education-office/2014-chesapeake-bay-program-materials/>. PACD maintains a Chesapeake Bay Education Office presence on its website (www.pacd.org) and disseminates the information and resources resident on the site.

- The Chesapeake Bay Program Conservation District and PA Agency Staff Meeting (Deliverable #1) was posted on the PACD website as “save the date” and when registration opened. The meeting was promoted in our weekly e-newsletter.
- The Clean Water Farm Award (Deliverable #5) was promoted on the PACD website, on social media and in our weekly e-newsletter.
- The Manure Management “Train the Trainer” Workshops (amendment) were posted on the PACD website, in the weekly e-newsletter, and social media channels.
- The Manure Management Manual and Chapter 102 Compliance Mini-grants (amendment) were promoted on the PACD website, in the weekly e-newsletter and social media channels.

Chesapeake Bay Clean Water Farm Award, in progress - PACD administers and publicizes the statewide Clean Water Farm Awards program. Program recipients are recognized during the PACD’s Annual Awards Program luncheon and/or at a local conservation district awards ceremony. The Program recognizes Pennsylvania farmers whose exemplary farm management practices result in improved local and downstream water quality. Those award recipients with operations within the Susquehanna and Potomac River Basins are awarded the Chesapeake Bay Clean Water Farm Award. For the 2015 award, certificates for the three recipients were signed and will be presented during the PACD/SCC Joint Annual Conference in July 2015. A press release on the recipients was written and will be released to the Department of Environmental Protection and Department of Agriculture in July. The award will also be announced through our social media channels and weekly e-newsletter.

Manure Management Manual “Train the Trainer” Meetings, completed - PACD assisted DEP to provide Manure Management Manual educational seminars for conservation district, DEP and NRCS staff. The trainings were for new staff members or for anyone wanting a refresher from when the training was previously held. Forty-six people participated in the training, which included staff from the following agencies: Conservation Districts (26), DEP (3), Municipal (1), and Private Consultants (2). PACD provided budget maintenance and oversight for the trainings, advertised the event, created an online form for accepting and recording reservations, secured the facilities, worked with the speakers, prepared packets of handouts to trainees, prepared an evaluation form and compiled the results.

Manure Management Manual and Chapter 102 Compliance Mini-grant Program for Conservation Districts - Mini-grants were available to conservation districts to hold local Manure Management Manual seminars/work sessions and one-on-one assistance. These sessions assisted farmers in understanding manure management requirements and led to development complete manure management plans. Guidelines were created and posted on the PACD website along with the mini-grant application. The grant round was opened. Applications were reviewed in an on-going basis and agreements were issued. Templates for grant materials such as brochures, flyers, press releases, postcards and agendas were provided to grantees. The

materials were then reviewed by PACD staff prior to workshops being held. PACD staff provided support and oversight during this process.

Obj 4: Chesapeake Bay Cost Share Program

153 Ag E & S Plans
 185.5 Acres of No-Till
 0 Barnyard practices
 1,338.5 Acres of Cover-Crops
 701 Feet of Stream Bank Fencing
 No Reported Crossings
 No Reported Spring Developments
 Other work performed during this reporting period:
 County conservation districts reported these additional activities/BMPs:

5 conservation plans
 36 manure tests
 25 soil health tests
 180 fields tested for 20 producers
 1 soil health workshop held by Luzerne Conservation District
 1 cropland field day held by Fulton Conservation District
 2 cover crop conferences
 44 full-day MMM workshops
 43 half-day MMM workshops
 Interseeder equipment purchased by Clinton Conservation District
 Conservation tillage survey done for 61 counties
 Implementation of test cover crop survey for 5 counties
 76 feet of access road
 1353 sq. ft. of animal walkways
 2 roofed manure storage facilities
 2 water wells

Additional Ag BMPs

December 2014, DEP solicited ag BMP Special Projects from the county conservation districts to utilize CBIG funds. These projects were reviewed/ranked/selected by DEP. The list of selected projects was presented to the State Conservation Commission at their public meeting in March 2015. SCC approved the use of Special Projects Agreements for this list of projects. There are 55 ag BMP projects at a cost of \$1,533,511 in this round of special projects. DEP began the contracting process with the conservation districts for these projects but the process was delayed and was not completed by June 30, 2015. (These funds will be shown as “commitments” and then “expended” in subsequent reports.)

Obj 5: Local Stormwater BMP Implementation Funding

The grant application, bulletin notice, press release, website language are all finalized. This took longer than expected due to issues that came up related to the Department’s legal authority to award grants to municipal authorities. This has now been resolved. Full package has now been approved by everyone and is ready for publication. Revised timeline is as follows:

August 8, 2015 – Publication in the ***PA Bulletin***. Announce availability of grants on website, in Update, etc.

October 9, 2015 – Deadline for submitting applications.

January 2016 – Announcement of grant awards

March 1, 2016 – Start date of 2-year contracts

Work activities for the period 7/1/14 – 12/31/14:

Work includes the development of new/revised timeline, grant application forms, grant award amount and grant project ranking and selection process.

Obj 6: USGS Project – Smallmouth Bass Thiamine Study

The Joint Funding Agreement (JFA) with the Wellsboro USGS lab has been developed and is undergoing review and approval. The document is in the final legal review before execution

No field work has been performed under this Objective for this time period. Field work is expected to get underway in 2015, as efforts have been initiated in anticipation of a final agreement.

b. Is the work under the agreement on schedule?

Response: Yes, it's on schedule with the most recent progress report. However, some obstacles have come up with Obj 5, (which is the local government funding).

c. Is the actual work being performed within the scope of the recipient's work plan?

Response: Yes

d. In accordance with Resource Management Directive 2520-03-P1, Responsibilities for Reviewing Unliquidated Obligations, does the most current revised workplan specify target dates and milestones for timely project completion to the maximum extent practicable?

http://intranet.epa.gov/ocfo/policies/direct/2520-03-P1_ULO.pdf

Response: Yes

e. Are the recipient's staff and facilities appropriate to handle the work under the agreement?

Response: Yes

f. Based upon the progress reports and this review, is the recipient:

- **Generally submitting progress reports as required in the award and on time?**

Response: Yes

- **Submitting products/progress reports that are acceptable?**

Response: Yes

- **Has the recipient been notified in writing that the products/progress reports received to date are acceptable or not acceptable and the project file documented accordingly? If not, please notify the recipient and document the project file as a result of this monitoring review?**

Response: Yes

- **Meeting milestones and/or targets described in the award and/or scope of work?**

Response: Yes

Note: Questions g. and h. pertain to environmental results. If your grant was awarded on or after January 1, 2005, the official date the Environmental Results Policy became effective, answer both g. and

h. The CBP Grant and Cooperative Agreement Guidance states that the recipient is required to attach to each applicable performance report (semi-annual, quarterly, or final) an updated Work Plan and Progress Made Performance Results Under Assistance Agreements Form that was submitted with the grant application. If not received, obtain copy from recipient to assist in responding to questions g. and h. and to document file. If your grant was awarded prior to January 1, 2005, answer both questions as "NA".

g. Is the recipient making agreed-upon progress in achieving outcomes and outputs (to the maximum extent practicable) and associated milestones in the assistance agreement work plan?

Response: Yes

h. If the recipient is experiencing significant problems meeting agreed-upon outcomes and outputs, has the recipient been required to develop and implement a corrective action plan?

Response: No

4. Agreement Specific: POs to discuss which areas apply to this agreement, otherwise, NA:

>Reviewing progress reports and other work products to assure that the recipient is complying with the applicable programmatic regulations and programmatic terms and conditions in the agreement.

> Notifying Grants Office if the recipient is not complying with the terms and conditions of the agreement,

> Providing technical assistance to recipients when requested or required by the programmatic terms and conditions of the award.

>Assisting the recipient, where appropriate, with the development of a plan to conduct subsequent portions of the project.

a.) Pre-Award Costs: (2 CFR 1500.8)

• Did the recipient incur costs prior to receiving the award?

Response: Yes. Three payments were processed prior to or on the CBIG award date of 9/29/2014. These payments totaled \$57,809.70. Pre-award costs had previously been approved.

• If so, was the recipient's written request approved by the PO, file documented, and included on the assistance agreement?

Response: Yes

b.) Programmatic Conditions, Regulatory, and Statutory Requirements:

1. Programmatic Conditions:

a. Is the recipient complying with applicable programmatic terms and conditions of the award?

Response: Yes

b. Has the recipient submitted Quality Assurance Project Plan (s) (QAPP)? If not applicable, list N/A?

Response: The QAPP's for both the "TMDL Development" (Obj. 2) and the "Smallmouth Bass Study" (Obj. 6) were submitted 11/24/14. Approval was subsequently received in April 2015. The QAPP for "Point Source Data" was submitted 12/05/14 and the QAPP for "NPS BMP Data" was submitted 1/13/15, however approval is still pending for both QAPP's.

If yes, has the QAPP(s) been approved?

Response: See the above response.

c. Has the recipient submitted Quality Management Plan(s) (QMP)? If not applicable, list N/A?

Response: Yes

If yes, has the QMP(s) been approved?

Response: Yes

d. If applicable, is an approved QMP/QAPP plan documented in file?

(If QMP/QAPP not in file or approved, find out why? Contact is Mary Ellen Ley.)

Response: Yes

e. Are all personnel responsible for implementing the QMP/QAPP familiar with its requirements?

Respond N/A if not applicable.

Response: Yes

f. Is the recipient submitting quarterly payment requests? (via TIMELY PAYMENT REQUEST TERM AND CONDITION in Unliquidated Obligations Policy-GPI-11-01 Sec 12)

http://intranet.epa.gov/ogd/policy/gpi_11_01_interim_final_9_28_12.pdf

Response: Yes, draw-downs are being made more often than quarterly.

2. Statutory and Regulatory Requirements: (*Statutory pertains to Clean Water Act, Sec 117; Regulatory pertains to 2 CFR Part 1500 for Non-Profit Organizations, Universities and for State and Local Governments.*)

a. Have all Statutory requirements been met?

Response: Yes. In support of the Clean Water Act, Section 117, this project supports achievement of nutrient and sediment reductions from point and non-point sources, including agricultural sources to help meet annual performance goals SP35, SP36 and SP37, which is in support of the 2014 Chesapeake Bay Watershed Agreement – Water Quality Protection & Restoration – to achieve and maintain the Water Quality necessary to support the aquatic living resources of the Bay and its tributaries and to protect human health.

b. Have all Regulatory requirements been met? (*Use this statement provided the requirements in the applicable 2 CFR Part 1500 requirements are being met.*)

Response: All regulatory requirements are being met.

c.) Equipment/Supplies:

1. Did the recipient purchase equipment as planned in the agreement and was it used as planned?

Response: NA

If so, request a list of equipment indicating each item purchased and the date and dollar amount of purchase. Attach list to this protocol. (Note: Each item and its cost must be approved in recipient's budget and purchased only during the budget/project period of this assistance agreement.)

2. Did the recipient purchase supplies as planned in the agreement and was it used as planned?

Response: Yes

(Note: Requested and approved supplies should represent only the supplies that are needed to complete the approved workplan. Supplies must be purchased only during the budget/project period of this assistance agreement.)

d.) Travel: Was this authorized in the agreement and was it carried out appropriately?

Response: Yes

e.) Conferences: Did the conference comply with the Best Practices Guide for Conferences?

Response: NA. Pennsylvania Association of Conservation Districts (a subaward to DEP) holds the annual "All Bay Meeting", aka PA Agency Staff Meeting. Because a subawardee hosts the event, DEP does not need to fill out the food checklist. However, DEP is responsible for passing down the requirement/restrictions of the food/refreshment condition to the subawardee. This is also true for Best Practices Guide for Conferences.

f.) Contracting practices: Written Code of Conduct/Ethics: Federal regulations require recipients to establish codes of conduct to eliminate any potential conflict of interest and to establish disciplinary actions for those violating the standards. (Note: The general procurement standards are outlined in 2 CFR Part 200.318.)

1. Contractual Costs: Were contractual/subcontract costs authorized in the assistance agreement?

Costs must be approved in the contractual budget category in the assistance agreement.

Response:

If yes, answer the following questions:

- are costs consistent with the approved work plan? Yes
- budget category reflects funds for contracting? Yes
- the recipient reprogrammed funds to contracting? No
- subcontracts SOW consistent with scope of the assistance agreement? Yes

2. Does grant recipient have written contracting procedures?

Response: Yes – they are attached to all DEP contracting documents.

3. Competition: Was the contract competed/sole source; files documented?

Response: Over the five year period of this award, some contracts may be sole sourced and some may be competed. Files will be documented.

g. Subawards: Subaward Policy, effective May 15, 2007, requires all new awards and supplemental amendments awarded on or after May 15, 2007 must meet the requirements of the Directive. Subaward costs must be included under the “Other” budget cost category in the assistance agreement.

1. Does the work plan contain subaward work?

Response: Yes

a. If yes, does the recipient have subawards pertinent to the agreement/amendment work plan?

Response: Yes

b. If yes, is the recipient complying with the subaward policy requirements?

Response: Yes

h.) Program Income: (POs must work with the recipient to resolve program-income related issues on agreements that generate program income.)

• Did the project generate unanticipated program income?

Response: No

i.) EPA-Furnished In Kind: Was this satisfactorily used in the assistance agreement?

Response: NA

j.) Recipient Furnished/Third Party In Kind:

• Met the conditions under 2 CFR 200.306?

Response: NA

• Were any adjustments made to the cost share?

Response: NA

5. Based upon PO review and knowledge of this award, does PO recommend:

(Yes or No Response required)

a Award Amendment: If yes, explain if the Award Amendment has been discussed with the Program Manager, Supervisor, or Grants Specialist?

Response: No, not at this time.

b. Advanced Programmatic Monitoring: If needed, discuss with Lori or Holly to either add to current list, if not already on, or next year’s PO Advanced Programmatic Monitoring List in the Post Award Monitoring Plan.

Response: No

c. Administrative Review completed by Grants Office: Respond “No”. If major concerns exist to check “Yes”, discuss with Lori or Holly prior to responding to this question.

Response: Yes

d. OIG Referral: Respond “No” If major concerns exist to check “Yes”, discuss with Lori or Holly prior to responding to this question.

Response: No

e. More Frequent Baseline Monitoring Reviews (less than every six months)

Response: No

6. Project Officer Suggestions and Recommendations (define as either major or minor):

Note: (Recommendations should have corresponding routes to/for resolution specified in report. Also, when major recommendations are made, EPA should explicitly require the recipient to develop and submit a corrective action plan to address the major recommendation.)

Response: None

7. Recipient Recommendations and Suggestions:

Response: None

8. Identify any areas where the recipient is significantly meeting or exceeding programmatic expectations:

Response: None

9. Recommendations for the Grants Office, if any:

Response: None

10. Closeout Process (Applicable to Closeout Review): Closeout of the award occurs when all applicable administrative actions and all required work of the grant has been completed.

Note: (Project Officer should be aware of the recipients responsibility in the closeout process and review the general regulations (2 CFR 200.343) on Closeout Requirements with grantee.)

a. Are any funds remaining? If so, why and what tasks were not completed?

Response:

b. Has the Final Technical Report been submitted, reviewed, and approved?

Response:

c. Equipment: *Project Officers should be aware and review with the recipient the disposition requirements outlined in 2 CFR Part 200.313. If the recipient no longer needs the equipment, please request from the recipient a list of equipment purchased, its fair market value and date of purchase.*

- **Is the recipient keeping the equipment?**

Response:

- **Is the recipient keeping the supplies?**

Response:

RESOLUTION PLAN AND TIMING - PART III

Prepare Corrective Action Plan, if applicable, to address major recommendation(s):

1. Tell the recipient when the corrective action plan is due, and clearly state what should be addressed.

2. Tell the recipient to whom they should send the corrective action plan (EPA contact) and where to send it, including phone number.

Response:

Note:

1. Send a electronic copy of protocol to the recipient for comment.

2. cc: Holly Waldman, Annie Hamm

(Also, send to Holly & Annie any follow-up letters sent to recipient, and relevant e-mail messages)